

RUSSIAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY OF ELECTROTECHNOLOGY AND ALLIED SCIENCES. By *Paul Macura*. New York, London, Sydney, Toronto: Wiley Interscience, a division of John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1971. x, 707 pp. \$32.50.

Large and well-prepared specialist dictionaries are particularly welcome. They contain terms not found elsewhere, provide the best coverage of the vocabulary of their fields, and offer the greatest chance of solving a problem in the shortest search time. Professor Macura's dictionary fulfills all these functions. It contains about sixty thousand entries and is the largest of its kind. It will be most useful to anyone concerned with Russian electrotechnology.

There are, however, some inadequacies which might well be corrected in future editions. A specialist dictionary must have some size limitation, and here it has been achieved by excluding certain "nontechnical" words and most irregular forms. This creates no difficulties for the professional linguist, but will be inconvenient for technologists who have only a moderate grasp of the language. The defect could be largely eliminated without adding much to the bulk of the dictionary by using high-frequency vocabulary data. Word counts, giving the frequency of occurrence in the specialist texts, have been made for Russian electronics literature (the first appeared in 1968 in *Statistika rechi* published by "Nauka"). These lists should be used as the criterion for inclusion. It is not satisfactory to exclude words on the grounds that they are found in literary studies.

Another shortcoming can be put right more easily. Every specialist dictionary should list similar works covering the neighboring fields with which it overlaps. The preface mentions only two dictionaries, also published by Wiley. This seems to be more of a commercial advertisement than a scholarly or technical reference. The lexicographer has also failed to mention his sources, although this should be done both as a matter of acknowledgment and as a guide to the encyclopedic information on which his work is based. The latter is particularly important in technology, where the use of bilingual equivalent terms tends to obscure the differences in national practice.

But these criticisms should not detract from a very substantial achievement. Many people will have cause to be grateful to the author.

MARK ALFORD  
*University of Cambridge*

## LETTERS

TO THE EDITOR:

As much as I enjoyed Ralph Carter Elwood's "Lenin and *Pravda*, 1912-1914" (*Slavic Review*, June 1972), I must take issue with his final paragraph. This would tie everything into a bow, proving, as it were, that in March 1917, as in the years 1912-14, Stalin and other conciliation-minded *Pravda* editors were, as usual, disdaining Lenin's doctrinaire hard line. The analogy is not as neat as Elwood would have us believe.

The *Pravda* editors pruned Lenin's first "letter from afar" in ways they considered necessary to make it suitable to the situation in Russia. This could be

regarded as a parallel to the incident mentioned in Elwood's article, wherein young Molotov wrote to Lenin "that the editors in St. Petersburg knew better than the Central Committee in Galicia what the Russian workers wanted to read" (p. 367). But the pruning of that letter and *Pravda's* failure to publish "letters from afar" nos. 2, 3, and 4, dealing respectively with "The New Government and the Proletariat," with a "Proletarian Militia," and with "How to Get Peace," must surely be viewed in the framework of a situation quite different from and more dynamic than that which produced the Lenin-*Pravda* divergences of the prewar period.

In 1917 there was after all the actual overthrow of the tsar accompanied by a highly critical military situation. The picture was changing daily if not hourly not only in Petrograd but all over Russia. Would it have made sense for the editors to accept uncritically the advice of any person from abroad, lacking all direct information? Moreover, the gap between Lenin and the Bolsheviks in Russia had widened immeasurably since 1914. Lenin's horizons had broadened, and he saw himself as a world leader. In the meantime *Pravda* editor Stalin, for instance, could hardly have learned anything new about Russia while fishing and hunting in Siberia, and surely had not been thinking about Russia's place in the scheme of a European revolution. In addition, Lenin in early 1917 had worked out ideas that were entirely new and original and entirely unpublished in their completed form. Many of the ideas that were later to appear in *State and Revolution* were included in the second and third "letters from afar." How could the *Pravda* editors have been expected to understand what Lenin was up to? The Petrograd Bolshevik Committee, in its first vote on Lenin's April Theses, encompassing the thoughts expressed in the "letters from afar," cast thirteen out of sixteen ballots rejecting the Theses.

I might finally add that the *Pravda* editors, to the extent that they understood Lenin's ideas, were quite right about turning them down, for they related very poorly to the Marxian base upon which they had supposedly been structured. Those ideas eventually perverted the democratic essence of the Russian Revolution and, perhaps reflecting the split in Lenin's personality, turned its offspring into a bastard of monarchical and socialistic motifs, a Soviet tyranny so out of contact with reality that it characterizes itself as a higher form of democracy.

STANLEY W. PAGE

*The City College of the City University of New York*

PROFESSOR ELWOOD REPLIES:

Professor Page is quite correct in saying that I tried to use the last paragraph of my article to tie things in a nice neat "bow" and that it included a number of generalizations concerning *Pravda* in March 1917. I believe, nevertheless, that the points I wanted to make are valid. The editors of *Pravda* from mid-March to mid-April 1917, just as in the 1912-14 period, were more conciliatory than Lenin; they cut or ignored his manuscripts; and, consequently, they aroused his ire. In neither period could *Pravda* be considered Lenin's mouthpiece, as Soviet historians have often tried to make us believe. I totally agree with Professor Page's analysis of why the editors acted as they did, although I have some reservations about the consequences he sees in the actions of both parties,